DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 271 873 EA 018 663

AUTHOR Welton, John; Evans, Jennifer
TITLE Policy Implementation beyond the Management of Change: A Case Study in Managing the Policy Process.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (67th, San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *Educational Change; *Educational Legislation; Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Government School Relationship; Local Issues; *National Programs; *Policy Formation; Political Influences; Power Structure; Public Policy; Public Relations; *Special Education; Student Needs
IDENTIFIERS *Education Act 1981 (England); England

ABSTRACT

Using the 1981 Education Act of England and Wales as a case study, this paper develops a conceptual framework of education legislation as a significant reference point in the process of negotiation and bargaining that initiates legislation and continues throughout the period of policy implementation. A model of the policy process and the management of change must consider the impact of structural factors, the powers and duties of local authorities, and the influence of varying government policies together with the influence of local factors. A chart illustrates the dimensions and stages involved as new policies in special education emerged and were modified, clarified, and implemented from 1970-85. The bargaining power of groups affected by policy implementation is part of the wider structure of power relationships within central and local governments and local level agencies. Special education policy is realized by the actions of individual workers with implementive authority--doctors, teachers, psychologists--who together with local administrators make decisions about the way in which children's special needs are defined and met. This "action focus" approach considers the influence of the structure and context within which diverse interests operate. Twenty-five references are appended. (CJH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION BEYOND THE MANAGEMENT OF CHANGE:

A case study in managing the policy process.

ED271873

BY

John Welton - Senior Lecturer in Educational Administration
Jennifer Evans - Research Officer

University of London Institute of Education
59 Gordon Square,
London
WC1HOAL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John Welton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

***ABSTRACT** - The passage of legislation is part of an exercise in managing change - just one point in the process of negotiation and bargaining which formed the will to legislate and continues throughout the period of policy implementation. Using the 1981 Education Act as a case study, this paper develops a conceptual framework which sees education legislation as a significant reference point, a statement of government intent but implementation as a political process involving negotiation, bargaining and compromise between different sectors of government, between central and local government, between education health and social services, between administrators and professionals, and with parents.*

EA 018 663

AERA 1986

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION BEYOND THE MANAGEMENT OF CHANGE.

Dr John M Welton
London University
Institute of Education
59 Gordon Square
London WC1H ONT

Introduction

The development and delivery of both policies and services to meet the needs of children and families are inhibited by two forms of social division. Firstly the top down disjunction between those who seek to make policy and the employees whose job it is to implement that policy. Where "top" and "bottom" are depends on where one stands in the spectrum of political, administrative and professional roles between the legislator and the citizen. The mirror of this first case is way in which policy makers respond to the experience of street level professionals and administrators which requires a new or adjusted service framework. The second disjunction is between the various professional services working to meet part of the needs of children and families - education, medical and social welfare - each with their own political and administrative domains and tendency towards conceptual tunnel vision. The academic world of research into the needs of children and families mirrors the world of practice by focussing on the bounded worlds of education, health or personal social services at various levels. This paper examines research into the management of special education at natonal, local and school levels to explore the relationships between:-

(1) policy decisions at each level;
(2) political, administrative and professional decision making;
(3) education and other policy sectors such as health and the personal social services.

The paper is based on research into the development of special education in England and Wales carried out by the author with colleagues at the London University Institute of Education. The research looks at the implementation of government policy for special education enshrined in the 1981 Education Act for England and Wales. In seeking to make sense of the nature of change in the special education service, and its possible relationship to change in government policy Welton and Evans(1986) examined the literature on policy implementation in both the United States and Britain. Familiarity with other literature on the management of change in industrial and educational organisations, and also that on the management of curriculum change suggested that similar processes occur at all levels of the education system, and between education and other policy sectors. Policy making and implementation at national level is only one example of the management of change. Change is the normal rather than the abnormal condition of education management however Schon (1971) suggested that *"Organisations are dynamically conservative: that is to say, they fight like mad to remain the same. Only when an organization cannot repel, ignore, contain or transform the threat, it responds to it. But the characteristic is that of*

least change: nominal or token change." Whether change is at the level of national policy or local working procedures it involves political processes by which the policy is negotiated and modified during its emergence - formulation, legitimation and implementation. Models of policy making and of change in education have to take account of both top-down and bottom-up processes in the policy implementation chain. In order to make sense of the policy process we need to develop a multi-dimensional model of educational administration which takes account of the various levels of education policy making and implementation and their relationship with equivalent processes in other welfare sectors such as health and the personal social services.

The Policy Domain

The case of policy and provision for special educational needs provides a good example of a policy area which both in the United States and Britain has been seen to require central government legislation to provide means of accountability to protect the needs of a minority group. In both countries the domain of special education is characterised by strong professional, administrative and user interest groups; and strong sentient and organisational divisions between those responsible for meeting the various educational, medical and social welfare needs of a common client or client group.

Special education for handicapped children in England and Wales has evolved in an incremental way through the initiatives of voluntary bodies. Within the 1981 Education (Handicapped Children) Act the government attempted to create a legal framework to implement the vision of a service for handicapped children as set out in the report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young Peoplen the "Warnock Report"(1978). The "Warnock Committee" examined the way in which special education provision had developed since the WWII. A reappraisal of social values during the war and post war years in Britain led to an acceptance of the concept of the welfare state. A part of this movement produced the 1984 Education Act (Butler, 1981). Unlike the 1921 Education Act, which had treated the education of handicapped children as a separate category of provision, the 1944 Education Act required that local eduction authorities (LEAs) make provisions for children with special needs a part of their general responsibility for education. They were required to provided education for all children and to ascertain the educational needs of all children who *"suffer from any disability of mind or body"*. However the most severely mentally handicapped children were considered to be uneducable within schools and remained the responsibility of the health authorities.

The 1944 Education Act represented a major step in the general trend to extend education to all children and was followed in 1945 by regulations which defined 11 categories of handicapping conditions. The climate of thinking in which the Warnock Committee reported over 30 years later saw the policy framework

for the 1944 Education Act as based largely on a *disease* model in which special educational needs were conceptualised as pathological, resting within the child. The medical profession was the predominate group responsible for the assessment of needs and decision making regarding appropriate service and education treatments to be provided. Diagnosis of disabilities remained the duty of medical officers who were, in reality, the only profession sufficiently developed at the time to undertake this function.

Over the last forty years professional thought concerning the ature of special educationalneeds has advanced considerably (Wedell, Welton and Vorhaus,1983). Teachers and other education profesionals working with children have developed more specialised skills for assessing and providing for children's speical educational needs. This change in the approach to educational treatement of the handicapped was clearly expressed in 1970 when a new Education (Handicapped Children) Act transferred the responsibility for severly handicapped children from local health departments to the local education authorities. In 1975 a government circular of guidance recommended that assessment should have psychological as well as educational and medical input. The Warnock Committee arrived at the inevitable conclusion that special educational need was a relative concept. No clear line was to be drawn between the handicapped and non-handicapped children or between children with different types of handicapping conditions. The 1981 Education Act which followed the Warnock Report incorporated as a central definition the relative conceptualisation of special education need in its ultimate form:- *"A child has 'special educational needs' if he has a learning difficulty which calls for special education provision to be made for him..."*. Amongst other key points the Act established the rights of parents to be involved in specific stages of decision making about their children's needs and choice of provision to meet those needs, and gave them rights of appeal about the decisions made by an LEA. The Act promoted the integration of children with special needs into the ordinary school and gave parents greater powers that ever before. However, it did not go as far regarding parental rights about "mainstreaming" or the "least restrictive environment" as set out in Public Law 94-142 in the United States.The author has argued elsewhere (Welton 1983) that the Act established a legal framework for administrative and professional accountabbility most particularly through requiring LEAs to set out their decision about a child's special educational needs and the provision which they intend to make to meet those needs in a legal document called the "Statement" of special educational need. The schedules of the Act require that the "statement" should be based on educational, psychological, medical and other relevant professional advice, and that the written professional advice to the LEA should be made available to the child's parents. In changing the basic conceptual framework for special education, encouraging integration into the mainstream, and openning professional and administrative decision making to parental scrutiny, the government was promoting a major cultural as well as legal and administrative change.

The Roots of the New Policy

The White Paper on Special Needs in Education, the 1981 Education Act be seen as the definitive Government statement of assumptions and intentions about the education of a section of the pupil population of England and Wales. In this sense they could be called called "government policy" and all actions subsequent upon the passage of the legislation could be called "implementation of government policy". Such a simple view of the relationship between policy and implementation, and the relationship between legislation, and administrative and professional behaviour, presumes a linearity of cause and effect rather than a process which investigation shows to be inherently interactive and recursive. As Welton(1981) noted *"New laws do not arise in a vacuum, nor do they create entirely new forms of practice"*.

Legislation is rarely implemented as its architects intended. British educational legislation is broadly enabling rather than minutely prescriptive, encouraging the "reasonable person", "the enlightened local authority" to implement policy along the lines promoted by the prevailing (government sponsored) model of good practice . Where there is dissension, legislation inhibits the "unreasonable person" or "rebel local authority"(Welton 1982).

Weatherley and Lipsky (1977), reporting on the implementation of equivalent special education legislation in the State of Massachussets, described the way in which at the point of service delivery various school personnel (or *street level bureaucrats*) developed coping mechanisms to manage the demands of their job, which *"may in the aggregate, constrain and distort the implementation of the special-education reform"*. However, while the power of the professionals and administrators who operate at the interface between an organisation and its clients is difficult to control, nevertheless they are constrained by dependence on both the organisation and their clients for the continued existence of their roles (Barrett and Hill 1984).

All policy has a history and the Public Law 92-142 in the United States and the 1981 Eduction Act in England and Wales can be seen as one point in the development of ideas about handicap and the management of handicap in the education system. The Act had its roots as far back as 1966 when various organisations asked the then Government to set up a committee of enquiry into special education - a committee which was established eight years later in 1974, producing the "Warnock Report" on Special Educational Needs in 1978. In the following year, not waiting for the Warnock Committee to report, the Government issued its Circular 2/75 which, through its recommended procedure for identifying and assessing children with special educational needs, formalised the changing relationship between education, and health service personnel in the assessment and placement of children with various categories of handicap.

The Education Act which reached the statute book in 1981 and was brought into force on 1 April 1983 had a very long gestation

period. Its principles were formed in a climate of educational thinking and government policies very different from those which prevailed at the time of its implementation. The changes in professional thought about the education of children with special educational needs were reflected in the shift of responsibility for severely subnormal children from Health to Education in 1970, and the espousal by the Warnock Committee of the relative principle of need. The policy of integrating children with special educational needs within ordinary schools had roots in the wider move to incorporate "minority groups" within mainstream institutions and can be seen as a logical development of the principle of comprehensive education. Similarly the rights given to parents in the 1981 Act to see the written professional advice on which local education authorities make decisions about children's needs and provision had its origin in the broader movement for a citizens' rights to information and to be involved in decision- making about their own future. Even the way in which the Act failed to take any explicit account of resource provision reflects an approach to the management of change reminiscent of the 1960s period of expansion rather than the financial stringencies which were to accompany the Act's implementation.

The point at which the main tenets of new Government policy crystallise are unclear. The principal officer (civil servant) in the Department of Education and Science responsible for coordinating work on the Education Bill claimed in a radio interview that the White Paper could not be published until the Government had a broad idea about the framework of the legislation, although the details still needed to be filled in. Then draft instructions were given to parliamentary counsel as to the scope and detail of a Bill. Counsel and the Department then negotiated over the exact wording of clauses. The Minister involved then sought approval of the draft by cabinet colleagues in committee.

Examination of the White Paper on Special Education, the Bill, Hansard, the Act, the Regulations and Circulars of Guidance to Local Authorities indicates that further developments took place on the basis as well as the detail of Government policy during the passage of the legislation through Parliament, and between the granting of Royal Assent and the delayed publication of the Circulars of Guidance early in 1983. A further period of definition and redefiniton followed as the Department responded to local education authority, professional, parent, and pressure group requests for clarification of principles and procedures.

The then Minister of State for Education, Baroness Young, described the Education Bill as an important statement of intention... as Government policy intended to achieve a new legal framework... to cause everyone with responsibility for children with special educational needs to look again at their practices to see that each child got the maximum educational advantage .....and to be a starting point for all LEAs to match the practice of the best . Elsewhere she noted the roots of the legislation and possible criticism that -

> *"somewhere on the long road leading from the Warnock Report towards legislation some of the spirit of the report appears to have been lost...this is not the case. It is simply that in translating recommendations into law we move into the dispassionate world of the lawyers, who like builders have to construct secure foundations on which the building can rise."*

Later in the same speech, Baroness Young noted the limited power of the legislator over the process of implementation. The Warnock Report had emphasised the roles and rights of parents in decision making about a child's special educational needs, but as she said -

> *"The law is not the place ..... where feeling can be enshrined. Legislation can insist for example that the parents must be consulted over the provision made for their child, but it cannot ensure that this is always done with as much understanding as we all would like. As the Warnock Report so rightly recognised, nothing ...would be fully effective without changes in attitudes"* (held by professionals and administrators) *"and that cannot be achieved by legislation".*

The question arises as to how far the Warnock Committee recommendations were reflecting real trends in professional and administrative opinion or were flying a kite for their preferred option from amongst a range of ideas and practice. In framing the 1981 Act, the Government clearly felt that the special education service was ready to move in the direction charted by Warnock. The history of previous education reports such as Plowden (1967) indicates that the majority of practitioners may be much less ready to take on new attitudes, practices and arrangements than had been envisaged.

The Policy Process

Policy is not a "fix" from which action flows. The "top down" approach to the study of implementation is important for service managers, whether civil servants or local government officers, who are accountable for the delivery and protection as well as the development of policy. Barrett and Hill (1984) note that *"the process of implementation is essentially a political process characterised by negotiation, bargaining and compromise between those groups seeking to influence (or change) the actions of others, and those upon whom influence is being brought to bear."* The two studies of the development and administration of special education policy directed by Welton and Wedell at the University of London Institute of Education indicate that very similar processes of negotiation, bargaining and compromise occur during the period leading to design of new legislation, during its passage through parliament and in its implementation. A change of legislation may be seen as just one significant event in the general process of service and policy development. Barrett and Hill (1984) concur that *"the political processes by which policy is mediated, negotiated, and modified during its formulation and legitimation do not stop when initial policy decisions have been made: but continue to influence policy*

through the behaviour of those responsible for its implementation and those affected by policy acting to protect or enhance their own interests."

As a starting point for understanding the development and implementation of policy Barrett and Hill(1984) suggest the study of the *policy process*, or as Hill (1980) describes it, a *policy implementation chain* within which issues are increasingly solidified. Evans (1984) summarised a multi-dimensional model for understanding the way in which local authorities adapt to new legislation. Like Barrett and Hill(1984), Evans recognised the variety of actors and agencies involved and the linkages between them - their value systems, interests, relative autonomies and power bases; and the interactions taking place between them - in particular their negotiating and bargaining behaviour. She suggested that local authority departments should be viewed from four distinct, but related perspectives:

1 the local education department as a formal organisation set up for a specific purpose and accountable to the local authority, to central government and to the electorate;

2 the local authority as a decision making body at all levels, from street level to political level, involving the exercise of political, administrative and professional power and authority;

3 the local authority as a collection of political, professional, officer, and user interest groups;

4 the local authority as a collection of individuals seeking to fulfill their own as well as clients' needs.

Policy is made and implemented at all levels of welfare service activity. Government policy, such as that promoted by the 1981 Education Act, is just one factor shaping the relationships and behaviour which go to make up the the service as delivered to and experienced by children with special education needs and their parents. The service which is delivered emerged as an outcome of interaction between central government legislation, local authority policy, administrative and professional policy and the coping behaviour of professionals and others working with children and families. Government policy backed by legislation is a special case in having potential power to modify arrangements and behaviour, to supply or remove resources or even to disband a tier of administration or service. However as noted above, Baroness Young recognised that in a field such as special education, legislation cannot easily change professional and we might add administrative attitudes and behaviour. Even where a government has legislative authority, it may be unwilling to exercise that authority coercively, lacking the means to ensure compliance. The fact that national educational policy is implemented through quasi-autonomous local education authorities determines the strategies which government adopts in seeking to manage change by obtaining compliance to its policy priorities. Further, a policy issue such as special education involves the education, health and social services - separate policy sectors

at both central and local levels of government.

Whitmore(1984) has developed an approach to the analysis of policy and implementation based on Knoepfel and Weidner's(1982) model of a policy core embedded in programme shells. Whitmore identifies six aspects of policy formulation and implementation:-

1 *the core dimension* - in this case the problem of special education;

2 *the policy paradigm* - i.e. the way the problem and solutions to the problem are defined;

"policy" is carried out at the field worker/client level.

Whitmore describes the model not so much as a core surrounded by shells, as the layers of an onion. A multi-dimensional model in which each of the layers comes in contact with and influences the other. The processes which led eventually to the Royal Assent to the 1981 Education Act and which continue from that date reflect processes of adaptation between each of the components which Whitmore identifies.

1 Changes in the core dimension, the policy issue: the emergence of a new way of conceptualising the problem of the education of handicapped children;

2 Changes in the policy paradigm: the way in which special educational need is defined, and provision conceived e.g. in relation to integration, and the contribution of parents;

3 Changes in the policy framework: the legislation and circulars of guidance;

4 Changes in the relationship between organisations: central government and local education, social service and health authorities and between each at local level.

5 Changes in administrative structures and processes particularly in the "statementing process" and resource allocation.

6 Changes in the relationship between professionals and clients.

Studies in policy making and implementation which embrace "top down" models would see the passage of legislation as establishing a "fix" from which subsequent action flows. However the study of implementation must take account of the existence of many, sometimes conflicting, policies affecting the same area of activity. Meeting special educational needs involves a relationship between education, health and social service sector policies; a prime example of a policy area in which there are several conflicting and often confusing and unclear policies operating at the same time, affected by various paradigm shifts and by changes in the policy and administrative frameworks which alter the relationship between agencies; the whole being affected by overall economic policies.

The Policy Framework

The process of policy formulation and the way in which policy emerges is not merely an exercise in corporatism. The dominant consensus which is established is rarely without its critics. The agenda for discussion and the people approached to give advice to a committee of enquiry such as Warnock illustrates Lukes's(1975) contention that power operates in such a way as to exclude certain points of view so completely that they are not seen as part of the debate. For example, although black afro-caribbean children were over-represented in special schools, there was no representative of the black community on the Warnock Committee. In the context of social and educational awareness of the early 1970s, race was not seen as a significant issue in special education.

Kirp (1982) has suggested that there are several possible approaches to the conceptualisation and evolution of a framework for social policy. He argues that the British approach to special education has emphasised "professional concerns" and "expertise", at the expense of legal norms or of the bureaucratic setting of standards. For example, in contrast to equivalent United States legislation, the legal rights given to parents under the 1981 Act are severely curtailed by the proviso that the Appeals Committee (chosen by the LEA) do not have the last word in decision making. Although the appeals machinery to be used is that of the 1980 Act, in the case of appeals against the "statement of educational need", the rules are changed so that the recommendation of the appeals committee is not binding on a local education authority. However Aldrich and Leighton(1984) and Hannon(1983) note the potentially constraining influence of the Commissioner for Local Administration (or Ombudsman) on the administrative but not policy making behaviour of local authorities.

Kirp also suggested that bureaucratic standard setting cannot be practiced either, since the relativity in the legislation makes each LEA able to operate the law to fit in with its previous practice and provision - accommodating the enabling character of the Act to the wide variety of practice and level of provision in different local authorities. In Kirp's view special education in England and Wales is conceptualised as a problem best tackled by professionals, whether medical, psychological or educational. Although there had been a shift from considering children as having what he calls "medical" to having educational problems, those problems are seen as being best solved by the application of professional expertise, mainly by substituting educational psychologists for the medical profession. For Kirp debate then centres on how such problems are discovered - ascertainment - and how they are to be overcome. The focus is on the child, but still on his or her difficulty.

The core of the policy process is the conceptualisation of the policy issue and the emergence of a dominant consensus about the nature of the problem and how it should be approached. The emergence or protection of a consensus about the policy paradigm

may be controlled by powerful interest groups which set the agenda for discussion and limit explanations and solutions to the problem within a narrow range of options. The negotiations and bargaining which go on as the policy is redefined take place against a background of constraints which limit the options open to policy makers. These include, not only the control over the production of ideas by certain powerful interest groups, but also structural constraints such as the mutual dependencies of central and local government, and between services at a local level over the execution of government policy. Whitmore's model (1984) needs to take account of inter-policy resource dependencies, across sectors of government and of social policy.

The dual government role of on the one hand providing the legislative framework to bring about change in the structure and processes of local education authorities and on the other hand making choices between priorities while seeking to manage the economy by imposing strict controls on local authority spending, leads to the emergence of competing policies which local authorities find it difficult to reconcile. Baroness Young described the British Government's position on resources in a speech:

> *"I readily acknowledge that additional resources for certain aspects of special education would help in achieving some of the Warnock Committee's goals, but I must say that I am a little horrified by the way in which a few people ..... said that nothing can be changed without extra resources. This is simply not true. There is scope for some re-deployment of exisiting resources within the new statutory framework and over the next five years the total school population will fall dramatically. This demographic trend must be reflected in the number of children with special educational needs. I suggest to you, that those who say that now is not the time to make changes, run the risk that the change will never be made. "*

In the 1981 Education Act the Government recognised that local authorities have to respond to local need and left certain sections of the Act as enabling rather than prescriptive. For example, the section on integration is subject to three provisos, including one which safeguards the "efficient use of resources". Some pressure groups have argued that although integration is central tenet of Government policy, this part of the Act will ensure that integration will not develop as the norm for special education provision. Swann (1985) analysed the numbers of children in special schools in the four years prior to the Act's implementation , and found no evidence of an underlying trend towards integration. The apparent conflict between the Government's endorsement of the principle of integration and the continuance of segregationist practice within LEAs leads us to question whether this aspect of the 1981 Act is merely symbolic legislation which the Government knows will not necessarily be adhered to by LEAs. The implementation of such legislation may have been found impractical or there may never have been any real power or intention to carry it through. However symbolic

legislation may still be an important negative or positive influence on professional and administrative thinking and practice. An indication of which parts of the Act form the continuing core of Government intention may become clear through the way in which it reacts to the declared or undeclared policies and practices of Local Education Authorities over such issues as integration, or use of the "statementing procedure".

Another example of the dualism of Government policy, and the tension between its functions for the economy, and for social welfare is exemplified by the Act's new definition of special educational need and provision. Lukes (1981) has argued that the relativistic definition of need and the removal of a duty on LEAs to provide special education for children with specific categories of handicap will have the effect of allowing LEAs to provide "as much or as little as they want". This may be an unintended effect of the legislation, but the introduction of such flexibility during a time of reduced public spending may have a different effect from that which would have occurred in a time of expansion.

Welton (1982) has argued that the means of examining local authority decision making provided for parents by the statement and appeals procedures established in the Act could , as indeed its architects intended, protect children from the effect of economic cuts, or poor LEA provision. There is already some evidence of conflict within local education authorities between the need to maintain spending on special education for children whose provision is protected by a statement, and the need to cut overall spending. It can however be argued that Government polices on local government spending will have at least as much impact on special education as will the 1981 Act. Shipman (1984) has argued that the tendency towards increasing centralisation of decision making within the education service is not so much to control education as to control education spending. *"The substantial threat is not a conspiracy in..* (the Department of Education and Science).. *but financial constraint exercised by the Treasury".* Whether as some commentators have suggested the Act was designed to assist the Government and local authorities to control spending or genuinely to promote and protect the education of children with special needs, its implementation cannot be understood without reference to other Government policies.

Policy making, and implementation at central government level involves a process of negotiation between government departments (to attempt to reconcile conflicting objectives), negotiation with professions, interest and pressure groups, local authorities and their associations, government legal advisers, politicians, civil servants and professional advisors such as Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools. During this process issues become increasingly crystallised and the consensus which emerges is at best a compromise which it is hoped will enable those concerned with special education to fulfill their objectives and obligations without endangering other governmental priorities or placing an impossible burden on the administrators and

professionals whose duty it is to provide for children's special educational needs.

The passage of the 1981 Act was, therefore, a reference point for those involved in providing special education. It is easily identifiable, fixed in time and provided in written form. However the way in which the Act is interpreted is open to negotiation and clarification. It is clear from our research that the process of negotiation and bargaining between and within both central and local government and involving the professions and parent groups continues - after the Act, as before it and during its passage.

Policy Contexts

Once passed and granted Royal Assent, new legislation becomes a focus for policy making at the local level, since local authorities have to re-evaluate their policies, arrangements and procedures in the light of the new monitoring framework. The complexity of the administrative response is compounded by the number of local agencies which are involved. Special education assessment and provision involves at a minimum three separate organisations: the local education authority(LEA), the district health authority(DHA) and the social service department(SSD), not counting the contribution of voluntary organisations. Each has its own history, paradigms, policies, structures and procedures. District Health Authorities are funded directly by central government and have no direct accountability to the public through local ballot. LEAs and SSDs on the other hand are parts of the same local authority, competing for revenue which is in part raised locally from an electorate to whom it is directly accountable for spending and service provision. District Health Authorities and local authorities are not necessarily geographically coterminous; a fact which complicates coordination of practice and provision. These different structures of accountability, funding and administration cause difficulty in coordinating the system of assessment and provision for children with special educational needs envisaged in the Act.

The structural constraints outlined above provide the context within which negotiation between local implementers takes place in order to provide a framework for policy delivery, including the coordination of action across welfare sectors to provide education for children with special needs. The policy/action distinction becomes blurred here, since it is often unclear to what extent policies evolve through an incremental adaptation of existing practices or as a considered response to the demands of the new legislation. Our study of local authority response to the 1981 Education Act suggests a range of behaviours from (a) rationally considered change, to (b) incremental reactive coping, and (c) rejecting or ignoring the demands for change. It is tempting to adapte Robert Mertons five modes of adaptation to describe ways in which local authorities respond to new legislation. Some LEAs appeared int he first instance to *retreat*, hoping that nobody would notice and that the legislation would go away without causing any real change. Other

LEAs adopted patterns of behaviour which *conformed* to that required by the legislation, still others *ritualised*, or went through the motions while making no real change to their policies or procedures. Then there were LEAs which rebelled against the legislation claiming that they would resist any attempt to force them to change. Lastly, there were the innovators who felt things could be better done another way. These last may be bloody minded rebels or pave the way to genuinely new good practice which may eventually be reflected in evolving government policy.

The difficulties of inter-agency cooperation and adaptation to change have been explored by many writers on welfare policy. Welton (1981) sees one of the major obstacles to co-ordinated planning and delivery of welfare services as "the inherited division of welfare" which (a) establishes and maintains the statutory and administrative frameworks, and (b) creates, justifies and protects competing definitions of client needs and professional response. Whitmore (1984), points out that when inter-agency cooperation takes place it happens on a temporary ad hoc basis which does not undermine the autonomy of individual agencies and leaving the agency domains intact. There are powerful forces within the various welfare agencies seeking to prevent a blurring of boundaries between them, not least of which is the concern for professional status and autonomy. Education, health and social service departments are staffed by a large number of different professional groups, each with its own structure and hierarchy. Whittington (1983) identifies several factors which inhibit cooperation between professionals working with the same client groups. One is that professionalism is a strategy of job control in which one of the main prizes is the right to define and determine the situation in a given sphere of work. In the case of special education, we have seen a shift from dominance by one professional group (medical), to another (educational psychology). This shift arose through a change in the way in which the policy issue (special educational need) was conceptualised and a change in the policy paradigm, particularly the way in which solutions to the problem were defined. A shift in the monitoring framework occurred both through the 1970 Act and the recommendations of Circular 2/75 which put educational psychologists, or educational advisers in the key position in the multi-professional assessment of children's needs. The shift away from the terminology of handicap to that of educational difficulty reflected and reinforced the dominance of educational paradigms.

Negotiation and day to day cooperation across the boundaries of health, education and social services are constrained by several factors:

1 Different geographical areas;

2 Different funding priorities and arrangements. The term "Cinderella services" applies to those peripheral activities which command low priority in the health services, but are key inputs into the support of children with special educational needs;

3 Differences in professional status and hierarchy;

4 Different professional ideologies;

5 Differences in the relationships between the various education, social service and medical professionals and their client groups.

The medical professions in Britain have high status and rigid hierarchies which stress the preeminence of consultants and the low status of paramedical and nursing services. Consultants operate as independent practitioners and have shown themselves reluctant to relinquish their autonomy in assessing and prescribing for their patients. Doctors within the child health service are less inflexible and more accessible. The community health service, of which the child health service is often a part, has a relatively low priority within regional and district health authorities but it also has a history of links with local education authorities in respect of children with special needs. Even so, some doctors find it difficult to accept what they see as their diminished role and authority, particularly with respectto discussing placement or provision with parents. However, agreement between the local education and health authorities about working practices seems easier to achieve than does agreement over the allocation of resources. Funding priorities in the Health Service lie elsewhere than with Community Health. There appears to be a shortage of almost every resource which the LEA might hope to obtain from the DHA. There is a tension implicit in the wording of the 1981 Act whereby the LEA is accountable for the provision of whatever is recommended in a "Statement of Educational Need", although the cost and control of some provision is the responsibility of an autonomous organisation, the DHA. The "statement procedure" requires teachers, medical officers, paramedicals, educational psychologists and other professionals to give written advice to the LEA without reference to known availability of resources. In principle the LEA is required to make a statement of need which is specific to the child's need and not affected by resource availability, but then to go further and state how it intends the child's needs should be met. The statement procedure was designed to make explicit the process of decision making about a child's needs and provision, and the relationship between professional advice and administrative and political resource constraints. Where there are insufficient resources available to meet a child's need the gap should be examinable through the incongruence between different parts of the statement. The Act therefore provides a means for making LEAs accountable for decisions about providing for children's special educational needs, but leaves them in some circumstances powerless to deliver resources whose volume is limited by other central government policies or controlled by another welfare organisation.

A prime example of this is speech therapy for which demand far exceeds supply. Speech therapists work with adults as well as with children, requiring DHAs to make a choice about priorities

between patient populations. LEAs cannot directly influence the allocation of resources by a partner health authority. Under the 1981 Act parents who remain dissatisfied with the provision made in the the statement can appeal but even if their appeal is upheld, the LEA cannot force a DHA to provide. This is a dilemma of inter-organisational resource dependency highlighted by the 1981 Education Act, and yet to be resolved.

Another example of the divergence between health and education authority interests concerns the integration of children with special needs into mainstream education. LEAs which make moves in this direction may find that such policy decisions have resource implications for the health authority. For example the placement of physically handicapped children in mainstream schools may place an additional burden on health authorities in the provision of physiotherapy. If special education is concentrated in a special school or unit, the physiotherapy service may be provided in a more cost effective way and with more specialist facilities. However, if physically handicapped children are in ordinary local schools, physiotherapists may have to spend much more time travelling to visit individual children in less specialist surroundings. Similar mismatches of objectives and resources are found between education and social service departments within the same local authority. For example, a social service department may have a policy of restricting the use of community homes and where possible returning or maintaining children within their local area. This leads to pressure upon local schools who have to cater with children who may have severe bahavioural or emotional problems which would previously have led to a residential placement. Similarly, the increasing practice by LEAs of returning severely physically or mentally handicapped children from expensive 'out-county' residential placements to educate them within the LEA puts extra pressure on social service departments to support their families. These examples illustrate the mutual interdependence of the agencies involved and the extent to which a policy decision which follows a change of policy paradigm in one sector may have resource implications and conflict with the policy paradigm in another sector.

The professional ideologies of those in health, social services and education need to be taken into account when seeking to manage change by formulating policy at both central and local government levels. The 1981 Act confirmed in statute the change in policy paradigm which makes the learning difficulties and special educational needs of the child the central focus of attention. It is possible that this *educational* definition may cut across the medical and social problems which are being dealt with elsewhere. For example, a residential placement for "social reasons" may be resisted by education professionals or administrators because there are no compelling educational reasons to justify extra expenditure. Similarly the medical needs of a physically handicapped child may be glossed over because his or her educational or social needs may be better met in an integrated setting. The multi-professional assessment of children's need was incorporated into the 1981 Act with the

intention of providing a means of resolving such inter-organisational problems, but in the context of limited resources, separately controlled, the statement procedure highlights the difficulties inherent in the social division of welfare.

Attempts by administrators to alter the framework and to impose new working practices upon personnel both in education and other agencies are part of the process of adaptation where local arrangements are not in accord with the requirements of new legislation. Within the education system there may be a tension between professionals and administrators and between different professional groups as roles are redefined and new areas of responsibility delineated. The education professionals and administrators will also try to influence working practices within health and social services, through negotiating new relationships with the other agencies involved, by reallocating resources or if necessary, by imposing new procedures. From the point of view of central government, all this activity may be seen as "implementation", but from the local perspective, such activities are still at the level of policy making and the outcomes in terms of matching service delivery to government policy are problematic.

The outcome of the formulation of new administrative structures and procedures promoted by the 1981 Education Act within local authorities should be manifest in the changed working relationship between professionals, between professionals and administrators and in their working relationships with children and families. These adaptations of behaviour and relationships may or may not be the intended outcomes of the policies and guidelines issued by local authorities, or reflections of the policy intentions of the government which sought to shape structures and behaviour through legislation. Weatherley (1979) contends that the behaviour of "street level bureaucrats" is highly discretionary. He maintains that individuals rather than organisations construct policy to enable them to survive and to continue to deliver to their clients such service as they are able in a new or changing situation. It is the service delivery workers who decide on priorities when resources are limited, undermining or circumventing new procedures in order to keep their workloads within manageable limits, to maintain the continued existence of their organisations and to meet the needs of their clients as experienced through day to day contact. The same processes which Welton et al (1982) observed following Circular 2/75 are now found in the way local education authority administrators and professionals are adapting the 1981 Act to local circumstances. Those concerned with policy and administration at more central levels (in central government, and centrally within local government) may see such adaptations as "policy failure"; it is difficult to identify which adaptive behaviour is (a) a genuinely exceptional and appropriate response to local circumstance, (b) bloody minded or incompetent disregard of agreed policy, or (c) a creative development which will eventually led to a wider change in consensus about the policy pardigm.

Given the financial, structural and ideological constraints built into policy making described in this paper, adaptation of policy at the level of service delivery may have an important role in reconciling conflicting policies. For instance, a shortage of resources will mean that decisions about limiting access to resources will have to be taken if the over arching government policy of restricting local government spending is not to be breached. Decisions on resource allocation taken at the level of field workers are hidden or unofficial. The 1981 Act demands that the assessment and the statement of need for individual children is to be made without reference to resource implications, but our research found evidence that statements of need are being framed to coincide with the resources available either from health, education or social services, and that professionals are being pressed to tailor their written advice to LEAs, to meet the resources which they know to be available . In some cases professionals have justified their apparently unprofessional conduct by referring to the alleged harm which would be done to parents and children by advising the local authority of resource needs which are unlikely to be made available. However the knowledge that their written advice will be made available to the parents may be an even more significant influence on professional behaviour. This process of adaptation at street level to defuse conflict for the local authority was also evident in the way in which special education assessment was conducted under the Circular 2/75 procedure which preceded the 1981 Act. Significantly it was just this kind of adaptation of the ascertainment procedure to meet professional, administrative and political needs which the 1981 Act statement procedure was designed to overcome. The difference lies in making the written evidence open to parents in the statement of need which can provide evidence for appeal against the local education authority.

The Circular of Guidance on Assessments and Statements of Special Eductional Needs (1983) promotes the view that parents should be treated as "partners" in the process of assessment and yet there are factors built into the system which make such a partnership unattainable for many parents; lack of knowledge (both professional and of organisations), degrees of articulateness, feelings of powerlessness, ignorance of rights under the Act. It is very easy for administrators and assessing professionals to manipulate and outmanoevre parents to achieve the outcome they need administratively or which, despite the wishes of parents, they genuinely believe to be in the best interest of the child. Parents who disagree with the LEA and insist on what they want may be seen as "trouble-makers". The aspect of the Act which makes the LEA ultimately accountable to parents is one which the built-in structural interest groups and organisational factors make most problematic. Even if parents manage to overcome pressures to conform to the wishes of the local authority and appeal against a statement of need, there is no obligation for the LEA to give way unless the parent is able to make a successful appeal to the Secretary of State.

Conclusion

This paper has discussed the process of managing change through government policy making by examining the contribution of the 1981 Education Act to the development of special education policy and practice in England and Wales. We have indicated that we view the passage of the legislation as just one point in the interactive process of negotiation and bargaining; a process which pertains to the conditions which formed the will to legislate, throughout the passage of legislation in Parliament, and during its period of establishment in and adaptation by local authorities. Such negotiations can be seen in two ways: as either positive or zero sum activities. That is to say the object of negotiation can be an outcome which is mutually advantageous to all parties (ie positive sum) or it can lead to a situation where if one group or individual achieves the outcome it wants then another group or individual sees that as a "loss" (ie zero sum). Such an interpretation of the outcome of negotiations depends on whether one is adopting a consensus or a conflict model of organisational behaviour. The situation within local authorities and health authorities seems more complicated than such a simple dichotomy would allow. The mutual dependencies of the health, education and social services and a consensus about the object of their activities (ie to meet children's special needs) do not preclude conflict over the means of achieving this nor the desire of one group to prevail over another in order to influence the way in which the goals are achieved. In fact the mutual dependencies and the power relationships between the three services with respect to children with special needs have been changed by the 1981 Education Act, so that one could expect conflict to occur as one group tries to exert its newly created power over another.

Bacharach and Lawler(1980) see organisations as being divided into various overlapping groups - work groups and interest groups - which form coalitions to enhance their power base or to exert influence on decisions. They argue that most interactions between groups in organisational settings are neither positive sum nor zero sum but "mixed motive". *"A mixed motive situation encompasses elements from both positive and zero sum situations. In other words parties are simultaneously confronted with incentives to cooperate and incentives to compete".* However Bacharach and Lawler see such cooperation and competition as part of the struggle to gain or retain power and influence and not as a result of conflict of perspectives or approach to a common task. Conflict and power struggles are not ends in themselves but are part of the process of achieving a common task so that within this framework the specific policy content and the formal organsiational context will play a significant role in the way in which bargaining and negotiation take place.

Policy implementation cannot be seen as a simple linear top down process, but as a political process involving negotiation, bargaining and compromise by those groups who are affected by it. The relative autonomy, and the power of these groups is part of the wider structure of power relationships within central and

local government, and between local level agencies such as LEAs, DHAs and SSDs. Bachrach and Baratz (1962, 1970) stress the importance of power and the mobilisation of bias in decision making. This process operates continuously, and at all levels - (a) on central government over the nature and interpretation of policy and choices about allocating resources between policy sectors; (b) on local government concerning local policy and priorities; (c) on individual working decisions at the level of administrative, and professional practice with children and parents. Ultimately special education policy is made real (Weatherley would say made) by the action of individual workers within the authority - the doctors, teachers, psychologists and others - who together with local administrators make decisions about the way in which children's special needs are defined and met.

So our model of the policy process and the management of change must take account of the impact of structural factors such as central local government relations, the powers and duties of local authorities, the influence of different and sometimes incompatible government policies (especially financial policy) together with the influence of local factors such as the political complexion of an Authority, demography and the historical pattern of service. It must also look at the negotiation and bargaining processes and the way in which policies are formulated within local authorities, where policies require new ways of working in order to implement or adapt tothe directives of central government. It is necessary to identify decision makers and policy making procedures within local authorities and health authorities and the levels at which decisions are made which effect the delivery of special education.

A key to understanding the way in which the policy process develops is the behaviour of interest groups which crystallise round common causes or needs. Ultimately the key indicator of the outcome of the the policy process is the way in which individual clients experience the service, the way in which their needs are met. We therefore follow Whitmore (1984) in taking an "action focus", whilst bearing in mind the influence of the interest structure and the context within which interests operate. It is important to stress that a description of organisational structures, relationships and interest groups provides the background for the study of action - the decision making which establishes new administrative structures and procedures and the context for individual administrative and professional decisions relating to clients. None of these on its own would be sufficient to provide an overall model.

To understand the impact which the 1981 Education has had on the emergence and delivery of policy we must make sense of behaviour which occurred over time but did not occur in a simple process of cause and effect, namely: -

the developments in ideas and practices which led to changes in the dominant policy paradigm for special education.....

the consultations (bargains and negotiations) between the Government and professional, local authority and parent/voluntary associations.....

the process of design and the passage of the Act and associated Regulations and Circulars of Guidance through the civil service and Parliament .....

the dissemination of government information, and the negotiated interpretation of the legislation with local authorities, professional associations and parent/voluntary groups.....

the way in which local authorities, DHAs and professionals respond to the new legislative framework.....

the dissemination of local authority information about its response to the legislation.....

possible adaptations in local authority, and DHA arrangements and processes in response to the new framework of inter-organisation dependency.....

the working practices of "street level" administrators and professionals working with children and parents.....

the way in which children and parents experience the special education service.....

Figure 1 illustrates the dimensions and stages involved as new policies emerge and are clarified, modified and implemented. What emerges from this process is - a *progressive focussing* - whereby the issues involved in the implementation of policy become *"increasingly solidified"*, (to use Hill's(1980) term) in a sequence of clarification, - a *policy-implementation chain.*

There is no clear cut off point where policy making stops and implementation begins. Government policy for special education is the product of definition and redefinition and the 1981 Act has become just one of the structural conditions or constraints within which local education authorities and professionals evolve their own policies about meeting special educational need. It is the continual negotiation between the actors and interest groups at all these levels which leads to changes in consensus about the policy paradigm and creates the conditions in which changes in government policy and legislation emerge. Could it be that somewhere in both the DES and the DHSS, there are files marked "The 1981 Education Act: Possible Amendments"; and will those putative amendments be the same in each Department?

But what effect would such ammendments have? Fine tuning perhaps, but the Government cannot predict or direct the direction of policy implementation with any precision. In any cse the targets keep shifting. Change emerges as the sum of the actions of all the change agents. It is a "zero sum", and certainly "mixed motive" and largely unpredictable - fascinating

for the commentator but hair raising for those accountable for making and delivering policy!

NOTE

This paper draws substantially from writing to be published in the British Journal - Public Administration, Summer 1986. It also draws from the findings of the Pilot Project on Assessment of Special Educational Need, as well as from the current research project directed by John Welton and Klaus Wedell on the 1981 Education Act. The authors wish to acknowledge and thank Gwynne Vorhaus for her contribution to the Pilot Project; and Brian Goacher, Klaus Wedell and participants at a project research seminar for their comments on earlier work. While each of the two research projects has been funded by the Department of Education and Science, the views expressed in this paper are not necessarily those of the Department.

igure 1 *Progressive focussing and the development of special education policy - 1970 to 1985.*

tages of Policy Development	Focus of Activity	Interests Involved	Constraints on Action	Action
hanges in policy aradigm	local	professionals administrators voluntary orgs.	Present practice ideas and provision	Warnock Committee set up
onsultation re-legislation	local to central	professionals administrators vol orgs DES, DHSS	present practice LEA structures professionals	Warnock Report; White Paper
egislation	central	civil service government pressure grps	other govt. policies LEA/SSD/DHA structures Warnock Report/ "public" opinion	1981 Act
nterpretation	central to local	ministers civil srvnts. administrators professionals	legislation, other govnmnt. policies LEA/DHA/SSD strctures and funding; professional & public opinion	draft Circulars & Regs.
statutory nstruments, irculars of uidance	central to local	DES, DHSS, LEA/SSD/DHA	legislation, other govt. policies local govt. practice & funding; professnl & public opinion	issue Regs. & Circulars
lissemination & nterpretation egotiation	central and local	DES/HMI/DHSS LEA/DHA/SSD Vol Orgs.	1981 Act, Regs., Circulars; Local govt. structures professional & public opinion	seminars confrnces letters etc.
EA/SSD/DHA policy ppraisal and ormulation	local	LEA/SSD/DHA professions "members" vol.orgs	legislation etc. local service-structures professions public opinion	policy adaptation
ocal authority lissemination nterpretation egotiation	local	"members" "officers" professions vol orgs schools parents	legislation etc. local service structures & policies	directives INSET etc.
structural and procedural change	local	"officers" professions clients	legislation etc., othergovt.& LEA/ policies	adaptation of strctrs prcdrs
rofessional/ lient interface	"street"	Profs./Admins. clients	legislation/local prcdrs./resources	service delivery

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

REFERENCES

Aldrich, R. and Leighton P. (1985) Education: Time for a New Act? Bedford Way Paper No.23, London: Institute of Education, University of London/Heinemann

Bachrach P. and Baratz M.S. (1962) 'The Two Faces of Power', American Political Science Review, 56 947 - 952

Bachrach P. and Baratz M.S. (1970) Power and Poverty. Theory and Practice . New York: O.U.P.

Bacharach S.B. and Lawlor E.S. (1980) Power and Politics in Organisations, London: Jossey Bass

Barrett, S. and Hill, M. (1984) 'Policy, Bargaining and Structure in Implementation Theory: Towards an Integrated Perspective'. Policy and Politics, Vol. 12, No. 3, 219 - 240

Butler, R.A. (1971) The Art of the Possible, London: Hamis Hamilton

Evans, J. (1984) 'Researching the Welfare Network', Paper given at the BERA Conference. 1984.

Hannon V. (1983) "Education: Some Forms of Legal Redress Outside the Courts", British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol XXXI, No.3 Oct.

Hill, M. (1981) 'The Policy - Implementation Distinction: A Quest for Rational Control?' in Barrett, S. and Fudge, C. (Eds.) Policy and Action. London: Methuen, 1981.

Kirp, D. (1982) 'Professionalisation as Policy Choice: British Special Education in Comparative Perspective', World Politics, Vol. XXXIV, No. 2, 137 - 174.

Knoepfel, P. and Weidner, M. (1982) 'Formulation and Implementation of Air Quality Control Programmes: Patterns of Interest Consideration, Policy and Politics, Vol. 10, No. 1, 85 - 109.

Lukes, J.R. (1981) 'Finance and Policy Making' in Swann, W. (Ed.) The Practice of Special Education, O.U.P.

Lukes, S. (1974) Power - A Radical View, London: Macmillan.

Plowden Committee (1967) Children and their Primary Schools (Central Advisory Council for Education). London: H.M.S.O.

Shipman, M. (1984) Education as a Public Service, London: Harper & Row

Swann, W. (1985) Is the integration of children with special needs happening?: an analysis of recent statistics of pupils in special schools. Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 11, No.1.

Weatherley, R. (1979) Reforming Special Education: Policy Implementation from State Level to Street Level, Cambridge, Mass., and London: M.I.T. Press.

Weatherley, R. and Lipsky, M. (1977) 'Street Level Bureaucrats and Institutional Innovation: Implementing Special Education Reform. Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 47, No. 2, 171 - 197.

Welton, J. (1981) 'Two Problems in the Study of Social Policy with Special

Reference to Education', Research in Educational Management and Administration. BEMAS.

Welton, J. (1982) 'Implementing the 1981 Education Act'. Higher Education, 12, 597 - 607.

Welton, J. et al. (1982) Meeting Special Educational Needs: The 1981 Act and its Implications, Bedford Way paper, No. 12, Heinemann

Welton, J. (1983) 'Implementing the 1981 Act', Higher Education, 12, 597 - 607

Welton, J. and Evans,J. (1986) 'The Development and Implementation of Special Education Policy: Where did the 1981 Act Fit In?', Public Administration, Summer, 1986 (forthcoming)

Whitmore R. (1984) 'Modelling the Policy/Implementation Distinction: The Case of Child Abuse', Policy and Politics, Vol. 12, No. 3, 241 - 267.

Whittington, C. (1983) 'Social Work in the Welfare Network: Negotiating Daily Practice', British Journal of Social Work, Vol. 13, 265 - 286.

LEGISLATION, STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS AND CIRCULARS

"Special Needs in Education", Department of Education and Science, 1980, White Paper Cmnd 7996.
Education Act 1981 c 60
Circular No 8/81 *"Education Act 1981"*, DES.
Joint Circular - DES 1/83, HC(83)2, LAC(83/2) - *"The Assessment of Special Educational Needs"*
Circular 6/83 *" The Approval of Special Schools"*
Statutory Instrument 1983 No 29 Education, England and Wales,- *"The Educational (Special Educational Needs) Regulations 1983"*

OTHER SOURCES

Schon, D. (1971) "Reith Lecture", BBC Broadcast

BBC Radio programme *"In on the Act"*, presented by Anthony Barker, 17 November, 1981.

Minister of State Baroness Young's address to the White Paper Conferenceat the University of London Institute of Education, 28 November, 1980.

Pilot Project on the Assessment of Special Needs, University of London Institute of Education, directed by John Welton and Klaus Wedell;

The 1981 Education Act: Policy and Provision for Special Needs Project, University of London Institute of Education, directed by John Welton and Klaus Wedell.